



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,393	03/28/2001	Kevin Watts	41EB-1015	3270

23465 7590 11/18/2004
JOHN S. BEULICK
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

ALIMENTI, SUSAN C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/681,393

Applicant(s)

WATTS ET AL.

Examiner

Susan C. Alimenti

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-34 and 36-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-34 and 36-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12, 14-34, and 36-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cansler et al. (US 6,725,257) and further in view of Avery et al. (US PG Pub. 2003/0208365).

Regarding claims 1-12 and 14-16, Cansler et al. (hereinafter Cansler) discloses a method for configuring a customizable product (Cansler, col.3, lns.34-35) except the type of product is not expressly claimed. Cansler's method comprises utilizing a server and at least one user interface/computer connected via a network wherein the user may input desired product attributes, i.e. in the case of configuring a vehicle year, make, model, and/or style are input to create a base configuration and then the server matches this request with pre-stored information (Cansler, col.4, lns.31-42). The standard equipment associated with the selected base configuration is established by the server and the user is then asked to chose optional equipment and/or accessories. The final product is orderable only if all selected components are compatible (Cansler, col.3, lns.58-65). Upon discovering incompatibility between selected options, the server automatically corrects the discrepancy and notifies the user of this conflict, resolution, and then guides the user to other options available at that time (Cansler, col.9, lns.8-26 & Figure 8). If the user manages to configure a desirable product and would like to purchase said product, the

Art Unit: 3644

user can opt to get a quote of the finished product (Cansler, col.8, lns.6-9). The need of the user is considered to be assessed based upon the options and accessories chosen at step 32 (Cansler, Figure 1). Even though Cansler uses the example of the configuration of a vehicle, it is clear that this method can be applied to configuring any type of product, including but not limited to an electrical distribution device as show by Avery et al. (Avery hereafter).

The configuration is accomplished through a visual interface or computer, wherein the server provides multiple web pages. Each web page has links and tabs allowing the user to navigate amongst pages and to make decisions easily (Cansler, cols.5-6).

In the case of utilizing Cansler's device for another product it is obvious that parameters, options, accessories, etc. would be different and specific to those of the specific product being sold. Avery discloses a system and method for designing, configuring and ordering electrical distribution transformers over a network interface, wherein the user can chose between various specification requirements (Avery, ¶ [0004] – [0022]). Regarding the steps of claims 1, 17, 30, 36, and 41-44, wherein the user can design a transformer by specifying a load type, "indoor" or "outdoor", etc. are obvious design options that are standard spec requirements, well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cansler's system to configure an electrical device similarly to Avery's system, since such and intended use would not alter the scope of the invention and is not considered to hold patentable weight.

Regarding the system of claims 18-29, the computer of claims 31-34 and the apparatus of claims 37-40, Cansler's device is considered to comprise the claimed limitations substantially as explained above.

Art Unit: 3644

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 14-34, and 36-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan C. Alimenti whose telephone number is 703-306-0360. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 703-305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

5. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SCA



TERI PHAM LUU
SUPERVISORY
PRIMARY EXAMINER